	IBGQFIGc	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
3	V.	18 CR 684 (VM)
4	CHRISTIAN FIGALLO and KENYATTA	Conference
5	TAISTE	
6	Defendants x	
7		New York, N.Y.
8		November 16, 2018 3:30 p.m.
9		3:30 p.m.
10	Before:	
11	HON. VICTOR MARRERO	
12		District Judge
13	APPEARANCES	
14	GEOFFREY S. BERMAN	
15	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York	
16	CECILIA VOGEL Assistant United States Attorney	
17	COHEN & FORMAN LLP	
18	Attorney for Defendant Figallo DAVID J. COHEN	
19	ZACHARY MARGULIS-OHNUMA LAW OFFICE	
20	Attorney for Defendant Taiste ZACHARY MARGULIS-OHNUMA	
21	VICTORIA MEDLEY	
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 (In open court ) THE COURT: This is a proceeding in the matter of 2 3 United States v. Figallo and others, Docket No. 18 CR 684. 4 Counsel, please enter your appearances for the record. 5 MS. VOGEL: Good afternoon, your Honor. 6 Cecelia Vogel for the government. 7 MR. COHEN: David Cohen, 950 Third Avenue, New York, 8 New York, for Mr. Figallo. 9 Good afternoon, sir. 10 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 11 MR. MARGULIS-OHNUMA: Zachary Margulis-Ohnuma, 260 12 Madison Avenue, joined at counsel table by my associate 13 Victoria Medley, and we represent Kenyatta Taiste who is seated 14 between us. 15 Good afternoon, your Honor. MS. MEDLEY: Good afternoon. 16 17 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 18 This is the initial appearance by defendants before 19 this Court following their arraignment on the underlying 20 instrument. 21 Ms. Vogel, would you bring the Court up to date on 22 what has transpired since the appearance and arraignment of the 23 defendants, any scheduling of discovery, and discussions with 24 the parties. 25 MS. VOGEL: Yes, your Honor.

So the defendants were arraigned on the day of their arrest on October 2 on this indictment. The government intends to produce the bulk of the discovery by Tuesday. We had hoped to have it today for the parties, but there were some technical issues in terms of getting it on a disk. And so I have been told by my colleague, Jessica Greenwood, who is handling this case, that we will be able to overnight that Monday to the parties. That's the bulk of the discovery.

There is some additional discovery that primarily includes the defendants' phones which are still being processed. So, for that we request an additional three to four weeks because it is simply not ready, and I don't know in this case exactly what the reason for the delay is, but I know there were search warrants done in this case, and it is not uncommon that if phones have a password on them, depending on the type of phone, it could take quite a bit of time to get into the phone and to create that discovery for the parties. So that's the government's plan with respect to discovery.

And my understanding is that not all parties are in agreement as to the timeline of when we should come back. My understanding is that counsel for one of the defendants is looking for a shorter date to come back.

I also would like to alert the Court that the government continues to investigate in this case, and there may be a superseder which would perhaps expand the scope of the

time period of the conspiracy and the narcotics involved.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Cohen, anything you wish to say on behalf of your client?

MR. COHEN: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, I was not the original attorney who was there on upon my client's arrest or arraignment. We were hoping to put together a bond package for Mr. Figallo. I've spoken with Ms. Greenwood about that. That would be our request. I'm not sure if your Honor would entertain that or send it to a magistrate in order to entertain a potential bond package.

I just received in court today the protective order that I was going to review and hopefully get back to the government in short order. And for now, sir, that's all I need to put on the record.

THE COURT: With respect to the bail package, it is this Court's practice to refer those to the magistrate court in the first instance. So whenever you are ready to proceed, just appear before the magistrate on that.

MR. COHEN: Will do, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Cohen, you heard what Ms. Vogel indicated concerning the discovery schedule. Assuming that discovery is produced on the time schedule indicated by Ms. Vogel, how much time would you and your colleagues require

in order to review and be prepared to schedule the next conference?

MR. COHEN: I would imagine three to four weeks. If we get it towards the middle or end of December, we would ask for towards the end of January for the opportunity to then schedule thereafter. So I would say about no more than four weeks to review discovery, Depending obviously on the size of it, but I think four weeks should be fine.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Margulis-Ohnuma.

MR. MARGULIS-OHNUMA: Yes, your Honor.

I am on behalf of Ms. Taiste very concerned about the pace at which this case is proceeding. We objected to the stopping of the speedy trial clock for this interval. She was arrested on October 3. She has been incarcerated that whole time.

I have been pestering Ms. Greenwood for discovery.

I'm now told Ms. Greenwood is no longer on the case, and she promised us discovery a couple weeks ago, actually, and that came and went.

So I'm very concerned. I honestly think that the Court should revisit its decision with respect to the exclusion of speedy trial time. I don't see that there is any basis for it. It seems like the government is using it to continue to investigate by trying to break into the phones. And I was just

informed today that there may be a superseding indictment coming.

So we would object to any exclusion of speedy trial time. If they are going to get us discovery on Tuesday, I mean, we would need a couple of weeks to look at it. So that would be excludable, but I don't see why this is taking so long. The defendant — we did make a bail application as well that we ended up ultimately withdrawing because it was vigorously opposed by the government, who in fact explicitly warned us if it was granted, would appeal to this Court. And the defendant, my client, Ms. Taiste, is a transitioning transsexual who finds herself in an all-male environment where her health and safety is at risk every single day, not to mention her mental health and the other problems of being in prison.

So we are very eager to move this case along as quickly and possible and would not consent to any speedy trial time. Other than that, of course, the schedule as proposed is fine, but we think the speedy trial clock needs to keep running.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Vogel.

MS. VOGEL: Your Honor, if I could just address a few things. Currently, Ms. Greenwood is still on the case. She will be shortly going on leave, but as of right now she is

still the AUSA handling the case, just to make that clear.

With respect to the delay in discovery, my understanding from speaking with her, the drive where the discovery had been kept had failed recently or at some point during this past month, and law enforcement had to really go and re-collect the discovery and re-compile it, and that was part of the reason for the delay.

And she has assured me that she has it ready now, and that the issue was it was too large to put on a disk and required IT's help and simply could not get it done in the time frame.

In addition, there is this protective order which was shared with the parties today, which as soon as that's approved we will submit to your Honor, as some of the records include personal identifying information, and that's the reason for the protective order.

I do think it sounds like the parties are in agreement as to the proposed discovery schedule that I've just set forth and to come back for a conference once the parties have had a chance to review that discovery and at that point address motions and any timing in terms of speedy trial time and the trial date that should be set.

THE COURT: Where do you think you might be, let's say, two weeks from today, Ms. Vogel, in terms of whatever additional discovery you still need?

MS. VOGEL: Ms. Greenwood informed me that she needs three to four weeks with respect to these phones. I don't have further details on why that is, what the technical issue is here that is causing the delay.

If your Honor orders two weeks, we will do our very best to make that happen, but that was the time frame that she thought was needed in order to produce that additional discovery. But I will note that the discovery that we can produce and send overnight Monday to counsel is the bulk of discovery in the case that we have.

THE COURT: Why don't we suggest, Ms. Vogel, that the government bring the Court and the parties up to date in two weeks as to where you are and whether or not it might be possible to get the telephone accessed by then. If it is not, then indicate why not. Perhaps at that point we can grant an additional extension as necessary.

MS. VOGEL: That's fine, your Honor. Thank you.

Just to clarify. If at that point we are not able or it looks like we need some more time, is that a letter that I would submit to the Court and the parties?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. VOGEL: Thank you.

THE COURT: In the meantime, let's look for a date roughly 30 days out for a follow-up conference. Perhaps by then the defendants will have had enough time to review the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

discovery that they will receive by Monday, plus if the government is able within two weeks to get the additional phone discovery, perhaps by the following two weeks, the additional two weeks, defendants may be ready to conduct a follow-up conference and indicate whether there is a basis for motion practice or to commence a discussion towards the possibility of a disposition. All right. Four weeks out? DEPUTY CLERK: December 14 at 4:45. MR. MARGULIS-OHNUMA: I have a sentencing in this building at 3:00, but I think that should work out just fine. MR. COHEN: I'm sorry. I have an interview with my child's school on that same day between 2:30 and 4:30. I could do much earlier in the date or late, late in the day. DEPUTY CLERK: December 14 at 1:00. MR. COHEN: That works. MR. MARGULIS-OHNUMA: Yes, that's good. Thank you. THE COURT: Ms. Vogel, is there a motion on that schedule? MS. VOGEL: Yes, your Honor. I request to exclude time until that next conference date on December 14. MR. MARGULIS-OHNUMA: We would object to that for the reasons previously stated on the record. THE COURT: Ms. Vogel, the reasons for the request? MS. VOGEL: Yes, your Honor. It's to allow -- at this

point we will be producing the bulk of the discovery to the

parties, and it will allow the parties -- allow defense counsel to review discovery and decide whether to make any motions based on what they have received. In addition, to possibly begin any discussions regarding a disposition in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Margulis-Ohnuma has raised an objection.

Mr. Cohen?

MR. COHEN: We don't have an objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

On the government's motion to exclude adjourned time from speedy trial calculations from today through December 14, one defendant expresses objection, the other one does not. The motion is granted. I find that the reasons conveyed to the Court warrant this exclusion of time as it is intended to ensure the effectiveness of counsel and prevent any miscarriage of justice.

The Court is satisfied that the ends of justice served by the granting of this continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial. This order of exclusion of time is entered pursuant to the provisions of the Speedy Trial Act, Title 18 U.S.C. Sections

3161(h)(7)(B)(ii) and (iv).

If there is nothing else, I thank you. Have a good day and a good weekend.

(Adjourned)